DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 224 JC 890 081

AUTHOR	Farland, Ronnald W.; Anderson, Connie
TITLE	Transfer and Articulation with Four-Year Colleges and Universities: A Report.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	Mar 89
NOTE	19p.; Discussed as agenda item number 4 at a meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Los Angeles, CA, March 9-10, 1989).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Articulation (Education); Associate Degrees; *College Transfer Students; *Community Colleges; Enrollment Trends; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; State Colleges; State Programs; State Surveys; State Universities; Statewide Planning; *Transfer Policy; *Transfer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

In response to state-level concern about the efficacy of the transfer function of community colleges, this report summarizes the progress made since 1984 in strengthening transfer and articulation between the community colleges in California and the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU). Part I offers background information on the issue, highlighting declining transfer rates and low persistence and graduation rates after transfer. After noting efforts that have been made to improve intersegmental cooperation, the report examines recent trends in transfer enrollments, indicating that the number of students transferring to the UC increased from 4,858 in fall 1986 to 5,840 in fall 1988, while the number transferring to the CSU increased from 27,761 to 28,300 in the same period. Caution in interpreting the trends is advised, given that over 50% of the transfers came from only 16 colleges and that underrepresented minorities continued to transfer at a very low rate. This section concludes by identifying concerns and needs for the future. Part II reports on specific activities undertaken in 1987-88 to strengthen articulation and transfer, including: (1) 2 + 2 + 2 projects among high schools, community colleges, and four-year institutions; (2) ongoing work to develop a general education transfer curriculum; (3) work to redefine the structure of the associate degree; (4) joint projects with the CSU; (5) activities of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council related to English as a Second Language instruction; (6) the Transfer Center Pilot Project; (7) efforts of the California Articulation Number Project to develop a statewide cross-referenced course numbering system; and (8) Project ASSIST (Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer). Part III presents an action plan for 1989. A list of 2 + 2 + 2 Project grants for 1988-89 is appended. (AAC)

ED303224

TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION WITH FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: A Report

Ronnald W. Farland
Acting Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Connie Anderson
Transfer Education and Articulation

JC 890 081

Agenda Item 4
Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
March 9-10, 1989
Los Angeles, CA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
March 9-10, 1989

TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION WITH FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES 4

A Report

Background

The transfer of community college students to four-year colleges and universities is a primary mission of the California Community Colleges. In recognition of its importance, transfer and articulation with four-year colleges has been identified as a Board priority for action in the 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1988 *Basic Agendas*. The recently adopted community college reform legislation, AB 1725, reaffirms transfer as well as vocational education as primary missions of the California Community Colleges.

After nearly a decade of public policy concern about the efficacy of the transfer function of the community colleges, an agenda item, "Facilitating Transfer and Articulation," was brought before the Board for information in May 1985. It conceptualized a framework for viewing transfer and articulation issues and outlined a plan for action to improve the transfer function. Subsequently, in October 1986, and December 1987, agenda items were brought to the Board describing the progress made in meeting the annual plans. Each included recommendations for action by the Board, Chancellor's Office, and local districts.

Analysis

This agenda item summarizes the progress that has been made since 1984 in strengthening transfer and articulation and updates the Board on progress in implementing the action plan for 1987-88 presented to the Board in December 1987. An action plan for 1989 is included.

Staff Presentation: *Ronnald W. Farland*
Acting Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Connie Anderson
Transfer Education and Articulation

Transfer and Articulation With Four-Year Colleges and Universities

Part I

Progress in Strengthening Transfer and Articulation Since 1984

Since the early 1980s, there has been considerable concern about the erosion of the transfer function of the California Community Colleges. In 1980, the California Postsecondary Education Commission's (CPEC) annual report on community college transfer rates showed a consistent decline in the number of students transferring to the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU). Of particular concern was the low number of underrepresented students that transferred.

Also at that time, a number of questions were raised about the persistence and performance of the community college transfer student. The *Kissler Report*, issued by the University of California, reported that the graduation rate for community college transfers had declined and an increasing number of transfer students were leaving the University because of academic difficulty. In addition, CPEC's "white paper," issued in the spring of 1981, questioned the ability of the community colleges to maintain a strong transfer program while also addressing the other needs of their increasingly diverse student population.

Following the publication of these reports, the California Community College Chancellor and the President of the University of California issued a joint statement reaffirming support for the transfer function. The Chancellor directed staff to conduct a survey of community college practices regarding the identification of and assistance to prospective transfer students. The survey, which was presented to the Board of Governors in 1982, highlighted an apparent lack of services designed specifically for transfer students in community colleges.

In its *1984 Basic Agenda*, the Board requested that districts undertake actions to develop or improve the transfer function. The Board also established the transfer function as a "priority for emphasis." A plan for addressing this priority was presented in which the need to establish an appropriate baseline upon which to calculate the community college transfer rate and the performance of transfer students was emphasized. In response, the Analytical Studies Unit of the Chancellor's Office collected and analyzed the available data in a paper entitled *Transfer Education*, October 1984.

In May 1985, a report was presented to the Board conceptualizing a framework for viewing transfer and articulation, and an action plan was developed. One of the key tenets outlined in the report was that articulation of community college curricula with those of high schools and four-year institutions determines the ability of

community colleges to perform their transfer function. Further, responsibility for making the transfer function work was posited as being intersegmental in nature, requiring the cooperation and support of all segments. Since 1985, the Board has received annual reports on the progress made in undertaking activities to increase articulation and strengthen transfer.

Since 1984, significant strides have been made in cooperative intersegmental efforts at the State, local, and regional levels among the faculty, student service personnel, articulation officers, and segmental and local administrations.

The Master Plan Commission and the Joint Legislative Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education have reaffirmed transfer as the cornerstone of the Master Plan and have initiated bold new recommendations to strengthen transfer. Notable among these is the recent proposal for Guaranteed Transfer Agreements. An Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC) has been established to oversee all intersegmental programs and activities, including transfer and articulation.

On the State level, special funding has been provided for implementing the Transfer Center Project, the 2+2+2 Projects, Project ASSIST, the California Articulation Number (CAN) Project, and the CCC/CSU Joint Projects, and for publications, workshops, and conferences to promote transfer and articulation.

The Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges has been working with the Academic Senates of the University of California and the California State University on a number of curriculum issues and projects. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senate has developed Statements of Competency of Entering Freshmen in a number of disciplines and has taken the lead in developing a common General Education Transfer Curriculum.

Because of the active role the Academic Senate has taken in intersegmental matters, the four-year segments have increased confidence in the role of the community college faculty in the development and review of curriculum, and in turn, increased confidence in the academic quality of community college programs.

The level of intersegmental cooperation at the local and regional levels also has greatly increased. Many campuses have created intersegmental consortia to work cooperatively on issues of transfer and articulation. Guaranteed transfer agreements, joint faculty projects, course articulation, cooperative outreach efforts, and regional planning have all developed and mushroomed in the past five years.

Although it is difficult to establish a causal linkage between this increased level of intersegmental cooperation and transfer enrollments, the number of students transferring to the University of California and the California State University did, in fact, take an upward turn in Fall 1987 (see Table 1). The number of students transferring to the University increased from 4,858 in Fall 1986 to 5,840 in Fall 1988. The number of students transferring to the State University also increased, albeit slightly, from 27,761 in Fall 1986 to 28,300 in Fall 1988.

Table 1

Number of Community College Students Transferring to the University of California and the California State University.

Community College Transfer Students

Year	Fall Term		Full Year	
	UC	CSU	UC	CSU
1965	2,948	14,603		--
1966	3,761	19,295		--
1967	3,702	22,059		--
1968	3,785	26,596		--
1969	4,458	28,207		43,963
1970	5,166	29,059		49,245
1971	6,154	32,546		52,989
1972	7,165	34,619		53,820
1973	8,193	33,089		51,335
1974	7,813	32,646		51,144
1975	8,002	35,537		52,917
1976	7,123	32,653		51,230
1977	6,392	34,001		51,159
1978	6,193	31,609		47,430
1979	5,649	30,428		46,326
1980	5,428	30,490		46,649
1981	4,778	30,026		45,283
1982	5,137	29,824		45,400
1983	5,305	30,274		45,726
1984	5,257	30,134		45,476
1985	4,931	29,682	6,574	45,469
1986	4,858	27,761	6,754	43,666
1987	5,465	28,252	--	--
1988	5,840*	28,300*		

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission, CSU Chancellor's Office and the UC President's Office.

*Preliminary data.

It is particularly encouraging that the number of "on-time" applicants for admission in advanced standing to the University of California for Fall 1989 has increased 16.5 percent over last year. (Advanced standing students other than community college transfers are included in this figure.) This compares to a 1.7 percent increase in the number of freshman applicants for Fall 1989.

These increases should be viewed with cautious optimism, however. Community colleges still vary greatly in both the number of students who transfer and the rate at which they transfer. In Fall 1987, over 50 percent of community college transfers to the University of California came from just 16 colleges; nearly half of the colleges transferred fewer than 25 students each. Those colleges that transfer the most students to the University of California are Orange Coast College, Diablo Valley College, Santa Monica College, and Santa Barbara City College. What these and other colleges that send larger numbers of students to the University have in common is their close proximity to a University campus, cooperative transfer programs between the community college and that campus, a broad commitment to the transfer function, and the socioeconomic status of their students.

Although the number of students transferring to UC and CSU has increased since Fall 1987, the number of underrepresented minority students that transfer is still very low. As Table 2 shows, Black and Hispanics are underrepresented in the group that begins in the community colleges and then transfers, in comparison to white students who transfer at a higher rate than they enroll in the community colleges.

Table 2

Enrollment Percentages for Major Ethnic Groups

Ethnic Group	1986 High School Graduates[1]	Fall 1987 CCC Full-Time Credit Enrollment[2]	Fall 1987 New CCC Transfers To CSU[3]	Fall 1987 New CCC Transfers To UC[4]
American Indian	1.5%	1.3%	1.3%	1.0%
Asian	8.6	11.7	10.6	14.0
Black	7.8	8.3	5.7	3.6
Filipino	2.1	3.1	2.2	2.3
Hispanic	19.0	14.7	11.2	10.4
White, Non-Hispanic	61.2	58.7	69.0	68.7
Others		2.2	4.6	3.6
Totals, All Groups	100%	100%	100%	100%

[1,3,4] CPEC, *Eligibility Study and Update of Community College Transfer Statistics*.
[2] California Community Colleges, *Report on Enrollment, Fall 1987*.

The total number of underrepresented minority students who transfer to the University of California is small. In Fall 1987, only 4 community colleges transferred more than 10 Black students and only 17 transferred more than 10 Hispanics.

Transfer programs are not fulfilling their potential for increasing minority access to the four-year institutions.

It is clear that new and expanded efforts are needed to increase the number of underrepresented students that transfer. For example, community colleges need to work closely with K-12 to assure that students are academically prepared for college-level work, beginning with partnership programs with junior high schools to encourage and motivate students to pursue postsecondary education. Outreach strategies between high schools and community colleges are needed to identify potential transfer students, provide pre-admission services, financial aid information, and academic advising. In addition, community college and high school faculty should work together to strengthen the congruence of their curricula.

Within the community colleges, efforts to increase the number of underrepresented students who transfer need to be a total institutional priority. Early feedback from the evaluation of the Transfer Center Pilot Project shows that it is unrealistic for just one professional staff member at a community college to assume responsibility for increasing the number of underrepresented minority students who transfer. Faculty, instructional administrators, and student service personnel all need to be sensitive to the special needs of underrepresented students, and be actively involved in supporting the transfer process.

Commitment from the other segments to strengthen the transfer function continues. However, there are two concerns for the future. When State funding is limited, the segments are reluctant to request funds to expand existing intersegmental programs such as the Transfer Center Pilot Project or to add any additional intersegmental programs. Priorities for funding within the segments take precedence over intersegmental activities. Continued fiscal support of intersegmental programs by the segments is needed to continue the progress made thus far in strengthening the transfer function.

A second level of concern is that, with increased number of transfer applicants from the community colleges, the University and State University may not be able to accommodate all eligible community college transfers. Without public policy that guarantees community college students the right to transfer to UC and CSU, all the special programs and projects to strengthen the transfer function will be inconsequential.

The Chancellor's Office is encouraged that the Joint Legislative Committee's report, *California Faces . . . California's Future*, includes a number of recommendations to guarantee upper division enrollment for community college students. The report contains provisions for concurrent enrollment at a community college and public four-year institution for UC- and CSU-eligible freshmen. Also, the report contains written transfer guarantees for each community college with at least three UC and five CSU campuses. Such a guarantee assures the student that his or her work will

lead directly to upper division study and reduces the uncertainty of applying for transfer.

Also as part of the committee's report is a reaffirmation of the 40-60 ratio of lower to upper division students at UC and CSU. This provision is critically important to the community colleges because it requires that the four-year institutions maintain space for upper division transfer students despite increasing enrollment pressures at the freshman level.

The latest version of the report also includes the removal of the artificial growth cap on community colleges, which adversely affects potential programs for students who intend to transfer. Students must have access to a full range of lower division transfer courses to be prepared adequately for upper division work.

The provisions for transfer guarantees outlined in *California Faces . . .California's Future* are vitally important to the future of the transfer function of the California Community Colleges. These guarantees are essential to public confidence in the colleges as transfer institutions.

Part II

Progress in Implementing the 1987-88 Action Plan

The following is a report on the specific activities undertaken during 1987-88 to strengthen transfer and articulation with four-year colleges.

2+2+2 Projects

During 1988-89, the California Community Colleges received $410,000 in funding to administer intersegmental 2+2+2 projects with the State Department of Education, the California State University, the University of California, and the independent colleges and universities. 2+2+2 projects are articulated career-education programs that include 2 years in high school, 2 years in a community college, and 2 years in a four-year college. The purpose of 2+2+2 is to provide continuity in the curriculum content and level of preparation as students advance from one institution to another.

The 2+2+2 projects are overseen by an intersegmental advisory committee that includes representation from the public and private education institutions in California. The advisory committee has responsibility for selecting the projects, for their funding, and for their evaluation. These are the first intersegmental projects for which the California Community Colleges have the responsibility for both fiscal and administrative oversight.

In November 1988, a total of eighteen 2+2+2 projects were selected for funding through June 30, 1989 (see Appendix 1). The 1989-90 Governor's Budget includes second-year funding for the expansion of the project.

General Education Transfer Curriculum

Contained within AB 1725 is a provision that requires the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges to develop and adopt a General Education Transfer Curriculum. Completion of the curriculum prior to transfer would be recognized as satisfying all lower division general education requirements of the admitting institution.

During the past two years, the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates has been developing and refining a draft of the General Education Transfer Curriculum. Currently, the three senates have reached agreement on a substantial portion of the curriculum. A subcommittee of the Intersegmental Committee is currently working on resolving remaining differences.

The Intersegmental Committee is also developing a similar curriculum for students transferring in majors that require extensive lower division preparation. Another subcommittee is developing policies and procedures for articulating the new curriculum once it is adopted by the three segments.

In the spring of 1988, as an interim step, the University of California adopted a UC Transfer Core Curriculum with the community colleges. Students transferring to any UC campus in Fall 1989 will have the option of satisfying the lower division general education requirements for any campus by having completed the UC Transfer Core Curriculum. For the first time, the University is delegating to the community colleges the responsibility for designating which courses will meet the requirements for the new transfer curriculum.

Redefining the Structure of the Associate Degree

In the California Community Colleges, very few students elect to complete the associate degree program. The associate degree is of minimal importance to students planning to transfer or for those seeking employment. Further, the coursework required of students for transfer is often in conflict with the requirements for the associate degree. Finally, there has been a proliferation of degree titles and variations, with little understanding of the distinctions implied.

In 1983, the Task Force on Academic Quality was created and charged with developing a student matriculation process, making recommendations regarding remediation, and recommending standards of "academic rigor" for courses applicable to the associate degree. In the course of its deliberations, the task force also decided it would be appropriate to deliberate the purpose, structure, and viability of the associate degree.

The task force undertook these deliberations for a number of reasons. First, development of Title 5 standards for the conduct of courses applicable to the associate degree led the task force quite naturally to discussions of degree structures. Second, the discussion was further stimulated by concurrent discussions at the national level by the Task Force on Redefining the Associate Degree, established by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). That group's findings paralleled those of the California task force, citing as reasons to restructure the associate degree: (1) very few community college students elect to complete the degree; (2) the degree has minimal value to students planning to transfer and to those seeking employment; and, (3) often the coursework required for transfer students conflicts with the requirements for the associate degree. In addition, degree titles and variations had proliferated, with little understanding of the distinctions implied.

In 1986, the Master Plan Commission's report, *Reassessment of the California Community Colleges*, included recommendations to strengthen the associate degree, including the development of an intersegmental "core" curriculum for transfer.

Spurred by the commission's recommendations, the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates developed a draft of the General Education Transfer Curriculum and a similar curriculum for students intending to transfer in majors requiring extensive lower division preparation.

The earlier work of the Task Force on Academic Quality on redefining the associate degree was suspended until the work of the Intersegmental Committee had progressed, since it was felt that the proposed General Education Transfer Curriculum would eventually become the basis of any newly restructured Associate in Arts degree.

Funds have been secured for 1988-89 and 1989-90 to support a task force to develop recommendations for the Board on the redefinition and restructuring of the associate degree. Questions that will need to be addressed by the task force include the following:

- Should the Associate in Arts degree be a transfer degree, with the intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum as the basis for the degree?
- Should the Associate in Science degree be designed for students transferring in majors with extensive lower division prerequisites, as well as for students in nontransferable vocational programs? Or should there be a third, new degree for vocational programs?
- What should be the purpose of the certificate in vocational education as opposed to the associate degree?
- What competencies or course requirements should be included in the associate degree beyond general education requirements?
- How can the associate degree become a valued degree for transfer or future employment?
- Should completion of an associate degree program mean that students are eligible to attend UC or CSU?

A report on the recommendations of the task force will be brought to the Board in September 1989.

Joint Projects with the California State University

During 1988, five joint CCC/CSU Projects in English and mathematics were supported by the two segments. These and similar projects are to be funded annually in various disciplines to identify ways to ease the transition between lower division preparation at community colleges and upper division study at the campuses of the CSU. The first projects included holistic scoring of student essays to encourage common assessment and placement decisions between CSU and the community colleges; development of standards for courses meeting CSU's general education requirement in quantitative reasoning; and regional conferences to articulate content and mastery standards in baccalaureate-level English and mathematics.

Because of the success of the first year of CCC/CSU Joint Projects, eight additional projects in English and mathematics were selected for funding in January 1989. The first year of Joint Projects has clearly demonstrated the importance of faculty-to-faculty collaboration at the local and regional levels.

A related activity during 1989 will be a Fall Joint CCC/CSU Conference on Critical Thinking.

Intersegmental Coordinating Council

The Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC) is responsible for coordinating and overseeing programs and activities between and among secondary and postsecondary segments. The primary ICC committee responsible for transfer and articulation is the Committee on Transfer and Articulation. However, three other coordinating committees, or Clusters - Student Preparation and Outreach, Curriculum and Assessment, and Improvement in Teaching - also engage in activities that improve transfer and articulation between the segments.

In the fall of 1988, the ICC approved plans of action for its several coordinating committees. The Chancellor's Office has assumed leadership and fiscal responsibility for many of the committees' activities. The Transfer and Articulation Committee is developing a compendium of successful community college programs designed to assist underrepresented minority students to transfer, the *California Handbook of Articulation Policies and Procedures* is being updated, and a spring conference on transfer and articulation is being planned.

The Curriculum and Assessment Committee is addressing a number of issues relating to English as a Second Language (ESL), including the articulation of ESL courses between the segments, assessment testing of ESL students, and improved preparation of ESL teachers. In addition, the committee is evaluating the coherence and consistency of segmental testing in English and mathematics.

The Outreach and Student Preparation Committee is focusing on the linkage between secondary schools and the postsecondary institutions. The committee is engaged in a number of activities to ensure that secondary school students and their parents receive adequate information about college preparation. The committee is also sponsoring regional conferences and training institutes to improve student preparation and college success, particularly for students from underrepresented backgrounds.

The Improvement in Teaching Committee has decided to focus initially on the recruitment of qualified individuals into teaching at all levels, and particularly on expanding the pool of qualified minority candidates. The committee is identifying effective recruitment strategies to draw students into teaching and encouraging their replication.

Transfer Center Project

In the fall of 1985, the Transfer Center Pilot Project was initiated at 20 community colleges in California. The Transfer Centers are physical centers that serve as the focus of transfer information for students at the college. Center staff provide direct services to identify, encourage, and assist potential transfer students, particularly minority, disabled, low-income, and other students who are underrepresented among transfer students. Each Transfer Center is served by representatives from neighboring CSU and UC campuses who provide information and assistance on a regular basis.

The Transfer Center Pilot Project is overseen by an Intersegmental Advisory Committee. An evaluation of the project is currently being conducted and will be completed in late April 1989. Although funds were sought for the expansion of the Transfer Center Project to 20 additional sites in 1989-90, they were not included in the Governor's Budget pending the outcome of the evaluation.

A report on the Transfer Center Pilot Project, including the results of the final evaluation, will be submitted to the Board in July 1989.

California Articulation Number (CAN) Project

The California Articulation Number (CAN) Project is an intersegmentally funded, statewide, cross-referenced number system designed to assist students in determining which community college courses can be taken to fulfill specific course requirements at four-year colleges. Since the project was established in 1985, there has been an increasing number of colleges participating in the project. In 1985, 42 campuses participated; in 1986, 69 campuses; in 1987, 85 campuses; and in 1988, 101 of the 133 public colleges and universities.

Although the project has been expanding, if it is to operate as originally envisioned, increased involvement by the University is needed in developing articulation to support State University participation. Efforts are currently underway to convene intersegmental faculty groups to develop descriptors for CAN courses as a way of increasing faculty confidence in the system.

Project ASSIST

The Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) in an on-line, microcomputer-supported, course-planning system developed for prospective community college transfers. ASSIST informs students if the courses they have taken or plan to take will satisfy major and general requirements at individual four-year institutions. It also provides current information on admission requirements and special program and support services available for students at each institution.

Originally, ASSIST was funded as a pilot project in 1985-1986 along with the Transfer Center Project. Currently, the eight general campuses of the University of California, ten California State University campuses, and thirteen community college campuses are participating in the project. Additional community colleges are interested in acquiring ASSIST, using their own funds.

The implementation of ASSIST has been far more difficult and complex than had originally been anticipated. A recent evaluation of the project concluded that, despite early problems with the project, ASSIST now has the capability to make valuable contributions to the overall transfer process, as was originally envisioned.

Funds were sought in the 1989-1990 for the expansion of ASSIST. However, the Governor's Budget did not include funds for expansion because the University of California and the California State University did not request similar funding. Also, there was reluctance to support expansion until ASSIST is fully operational at all of the pilot sites.

Part III

Action Plan for 1989

To actively promote transfer and articulation with four-year institutions, the Chancellor's Office will undertake the following action plan during 1989:

1. Continue implementation of the three-year, statewide, intersegmental 2 + 2 + 2 Project;

2. Continue support of joint projects with CSU, including sponsorship of a Fall 1989 CCC/CSU Conference on Critical Thinking;

3. Under the auspices of the Intersegmental Council's Committee on Transfer and Articulation, and in cooperation with the other segments, provide the leadership for the development of a compendium of CCC Minority Transfer Programs, the 1989 *California Handbook of Articulation Policies and Procedures*, and the Spring Statewide Conference on Transfer and Articulation;

4. Provide support, in cooperation with the Academic Senate, for review and adoption of the General Education Transfer Curriculum and the General Education Curriculum for majors requiring extensive lower division preparation;

5. Develop through the Task Force on Redefining the Structure of the Associate Degree a proposal for strengthening the associate degree for transfer purposes;

6. Continue to promote and support Project ASSIST and the California Articulation Number (CAN) system as statewide projects;

7. Coordinate issues of articulation and transfer that need to be addressed within the Chancellor's Office and then referred to the appropriate segmental and intersegmental committees and offices;

8. Continue to support and coordinate the Transfer Center Project and other projects designed to increase the number of underrepresented transfer students; and

9. Continue oversight of the Transfer Center Project and the pursuit of funding to expand the number of projects in 1989-90.

APPENDIX

2 + 2 + 2 Project Grants, 1988-89

Fiscal Agency	Other Participating Entities	Project Title	Majors
Kern CCD on behalf of Bakersfield College	California State Univ. - Bakersfield Kern HSD Kern HSD ROP	CAPITAL (Curriculum Accounting Providing Involvement Through All Levels)	Accounting
Butte CCD on behalf of Butte College	California State Univ. - Chico Butte County ROP Chico USD Chico High School Pleasant Valley High School	2 + 2 + 2 Articulated Career Education Programs in Automotive Technology	Automotive Technology
University Foundation, California State Univ. - Chico on behalf of the Northern California Higher Education Council	Butte College Oroville Union HSD Butte County ROP Yuba College Marysville USD Tri-County ROP Sierra College	2 + 2 + 2 Articulated in Agriculture	Agriculture
Cerritos CCD on behalf of Cerritos College	Bellflower USD ABC USD Downey USD Norwalk-LaMirada USD California State Univ. - Los Angeles California State Univ. - Long Beach	2 + 2 + 2 Articulated Career Education Model Program - Cerritos College, 4 Unified School Districts, and 2 California State Universities	Automotive, Computer Aid Drafting & Design Electronics Manufacturing & Business Education
Coachella Valley CCD on behalf of College of the Desert	Desert Sands USD California State Univ. - San Bernardino Palm Springs USD Coachella Valley USD	The TEACH Project	Early Childhood Ed. Teacher Assistance Bilingual Ed.
Compton CCD on behalf of Compton College	Paramount USD California State Univ. - Los Angeles Paramount USD ROP	2 + 2 + 2 Industrial Technology Articulation Project	Automotive Technology
Coast CCD on behalf of Golden West College	Huntington Beach USD Coastline ROP California State Univ. - Fullerton	Articulation and Preparation for Nursing Education (2 + 2 + 2)	Nursing Preparation: Biology, Chemistry, Math

2+2+2 Project Grants, 1988-89 *(Continued)*

Fiscal Agency	Other Participating Entities	Project Title	Majors
Imperial Valley CCD on behalf of Imperial Valley College, Business Administration	San Diego State Univ. Brawley Union HSD Central Union HSD Calexico USD Imperial Valley ROP	Imperial Valley College 2+2+2 Program	Administration of Justice, Business Administration
Long Beach CCD on behalf of Long Beach City College	Long Beach USD California State Univ. - Los Angeles California State Univ. - Dominguez Hills	2+2+2 Articulation Project in Manufacturing Technology	Manufacturing
Los Rios CCD on behalf of American River College	California State Univ. - Sacramento Sacramento ROP	2+2+2 Articulation: Partnership for Excellence	Business, Computer Science
North Orange County CCD on behalf of Fullerton College	Fullerton Joint UHS California State Univ. - Los Angeles North Orange Co. ROP	Management of Manufacturing: A 2+2+2 Articulated Approach	Manufacturing Technology & Management of Technology
Plumas County Schools	Feather River College California State Univ. - Dominguez Hills Butte College	Extended Nursing Ladder to Students in Rural Northeastern California: LVN to ADN to BSN Articulation via a Statewide Program	Nursing
Saddleback CCD on behalf of Saddleback College	Coastline ROP Univ. of California - Irvine	Development of an Articulated 2+2+2 Early Childhood Education Program	Early Childhood Education
San Bernardino CCD on behalf of San Bernardino Valley College	Colton Joint USD Colton, Redlands, Yucaipa ROP California State Univ. - San Bernardino	Articulation: Industrial Technology Ed.	Electronics: Aeronautics, Machine and Auto
San Mateo County CCD on behalf of College of San Mateo	San Mateo UHSD San Jose State Univ. San Mateo Office of Ed.	2+2+2 Technical Preparation in San Mateo County	Electronics, Welding, Drafting and Aeronautics
Southwestern CCD on behalf of Southwestern College	Sweetwater UHSD San Diego State Univ. University of California San Diego	2+2+2 Engineering Articulation Project	Engineering, Mathematics

2 + 2 + 2 Project Grants, 1988-89 *(Continued)*

Fiscal Agency	Other Participating Entities	Project Title	Majors
Stockton USD	San Joaquin Delta CCD Woodruff ROP California State Univ. - Stanislaus	Caring, Advising Reaching, Educating: Project CARE	Nursing
Santa Barbara CCD on behalf of Santa Barbara City College	Santa Barbara HSD California State Univ. - Dominguez Hills Carpinteria USD Santa Barbara County Schools	2 + 2 + 2 Articulated Career Education Program in Nursing	Nursing

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges MAR 24 1989